

From: ["Carey, Curtis" </O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP \(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT\)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=4CB6F75253154BFC8AA889F8A36596ED-CAREY, CURT>](#)
To: [Brooks](#)
[Karl](#)
CC: ["Slugantz, Lynn" <Slugantz.Lynn@epa.gov>](#)
Date: 9/10/2014 10:16:37 AM
Subject: FW: Congressional Staffer Inquiry FW: USACE agreement with EPA (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: [Record of Verbal Correspondence DeGregorio 9-9-14.pdf](#)

Karl, FYI, please review the attached pdf file. Suggest we discuss.

-----Original Message-----

From: Field, Jeff
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 11:02 AM
To: Carey, Curtis; Peterson, Mary; Sanders, LaTonya
Cc: Jackson, Robert W.; Slugantz, Lynn; Stoy, Alyse
Subject: FW: Congressional Staffer Inquiry FW: USACE agreement with EPA (UNCLASSIFIED)

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiefer, Robyn V NWK [mailto:Robyn.V.Kiefer@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 10:57 AM
To: Field, Jeff; Gravatt, Dan
Cc: Young, Scott E NWK; Leibbert, Jason M NWK
Subject: Congressional Staffer Inquiry FW: USACE agreement with EPA (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

I received the email below yesterday and returned Kerry's call to request that she send her inquiries to EPA and that EPA will need to respond to her inquiries. However, during the call, she did ask a couple questions and I responded in accordance with information that was in the IB Alignment

Assessment Report and the prepared talking points. See attached record of verbal correspondence.

I do believe she now understands that the Corps will not directly answer any further inquiries and that she will need to go through you from now on. For any future emails received, I will respond to her via email and CC: you and state that her inquiries are being forwarded to EPA for response. Any calls received, I will ask her to contact you for response.

Please let me know if you have any questions/concerns.

Thanks,
Robyn

-----Original Message-----

From: DeGregorio, Kerry (Blunt) [mailto:Kerry_DeGregorio@blunt.senate.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 10:30 AM

To: Kiefer, Robyn V NWK

Subject: [EXTERNAL] USACE agreement with EPA

Robyn,

It was good to see you and the USACE staff last night. I wanted to ask a question and if this is best answered by phone feel free to call me.

Since USACE has written an evaluation of the 3 possible PRP designs to build the isolation barrier at West Lake Landfill, how difficult would it be for the Corp to provide an alternative plan for consideration if requested?

The Senator is concerned with the 18 month design planning timeline. In your opinion what is causing such a delay? Not having an engineer degree I am unclear if this is a normal timeline.

Thanks again.

Kerry J. DeGregorio

U.S. Senator Roy Blunt

St. Louis District Office

7700 Bonhomme Ave

Clayton MO 63105

Ph: 314-725-4484

Fax: 314-727-3548

Description: Description: Description: Description: senate_logo Description: Description: Description: Description: FaceBook-32x32[1] Description:
Description: Description: Description: cid:image004.png@01CB66F9.FE728900 Description: Description: Description: Description: Youtube-32x32[1]

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE



U.S. SENATE



**Record of Verbal Correspondence
US Army Corps of Engineers**

Date: 9-9-14

Call From : Robyn Kiefer, USACE PM

Call To: Kerry DeGregorio, Constituent Advocate, Senator Roy Blunt's Office

I called Kerry to respond to her email dated 9/9/14. I told her I received her email and that I would have to defer her questions to EPA to answer. She was clearly annoyed at my response and asked, "even if all I want to know is what it would take to get the Corps to provide another path for the barrier?" I explained that what she is asking for is something that could potentially go beyond the technical assistance that is covered in our IA and that EPA would have to make that determination if we were to support in that way. She said she understood that a new IA could be required and that it would cost more, but could we do it? I told her that we would provide support to EPA however they asked us to support.

She then asked about the 18 month timeline and if that was reasonable. I clarified that our report stated it could be between 14 months and 18 months, depending upon the alignment selected. She asked again if that was reasonable. I explained that it will take time for the RPs to get the geotechnical information required for the design and if the alignment would go through RIM, it will take time to plan for that to ensure the safety of on-site workers, off site populations, and from a bird hazard mitigation standpoint, the safety of airline passengers.

She asked how the Corps does design reviews on Corps projects. I explained that the Corps' process is to perform a 30%, 60%, and 90% review to capture issues as early as possible in the design process so that we don't get to the end of the design, find an issue, and have to go back and possibly have to redo a large part of the design and lose all that time. I explained that the design review process can take approximately a month for each review and that there are ways that time could potentially be shortened, but it can impact the project. I told her the Corps had discussions with the RPs about how long it would take them to get the geotechnical data and complete the design and we applied our review process (30/60/90) to come up with that 14-18 month estimate, depending upon the alignment.

She went on to state that there is a high frustration level with the delays and that the AG is preparing to file suit against the RPs. Just before we got off the call, I told her that I understand she wants to be able to talk to us, but we really need her to have her questions go to EPA for official responses. She said that she talked with the EPA about lifting their "gag order" on us, but EPA said no. She thanked me for my time.

End of call.